



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/767,422	01/28/2004	Anurag K. Gupta	CML01363H	4533
22917	7590	04/05/2007	EXAMINER	
MOTOROLA, INC. 1303 EAST ALGONQUIN ROAD IL01/3RD SCHAUMBURG, IL 60196			SAINT CYR, LEONARD	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2626	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS	04/05/2007		ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Notice of this Office communication was sent electronically on the above-indicated "Notification Date" and has a shortened statutory period for reply of 3 MONTHS from 04/05/2007.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

Docketing.Schaumburg@motorola.com
APT099@motorola.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/767,422	GUPTA ET AL.
	Examiner Leonard Saint-Cyr	Art Unit 2626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 January 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 01/23/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Johnson et al., do not teach or suggest that a plurality of templates are accessed and determining if all inputs received fill any template (Amendment, page 5).

The examiner disagrees, Johnson et al., teach uttering the words "directions from here to there" while clicking on two positions on a visual map, the voice browser fills the starting location field with "here" and the destination location field with "there" as received input information while the graphical browser fills the starting location with the geographical location (e.g., latitude/longitude) of the first click point on the map and the destination location field with the geographical location (e.g., latitude/longitude) of the second point on the map (paragraph 35, lines 16). The concurrent multimodal session may include information indicating which field or slot has been filled by the user input (paragraph 57, lines 5 – 7). By filling starting location and destination location with "here and there" by the voice browser, while filling other starting and destination locations with geographical location (e.g., latitude/longitude) by the graphical browser imply filling two templates, since starting and destination locations of the voice browser mode are filled with different information of the ones filled by the graphical browser.

Indicating which slot or field has been filled by the user input implies determining if all inputs received fill any template, since slots are empty spaces of the template.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1, 3 – 7, 9, 11 – 15, 17, 19, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Johnson et al., (US PAP 2003/0167172).

As per claims 1, 9, and 17, Johnson et al., teach a method for determining when a user has ceased inputting data, the method comprising the steps of:

receiving a plurality of user inputs (multiple inputs entered; paragraph 21, lines 13 –15; paragraph 64, lines 1- 3);

determining a content of the input for each of the user inputs (“uttering direction from here to there, and the agent program fills the starting location field with here and the destination field with there”), and determining a mode of input for each of the user inputs (filling the fields by the voice browser implies determining a voice mode of the input; paragraph 35, lines 6 - 25)

accessing a plurality of templates from a database (uttering here to there and the voice browser fills the starting location field with here and the destination location field with there, while the graphical browser fills the starting and the destination location

fields with geographical locations by the mode of a clicking point on the map, which implies accessing a plurality of templates from a database ; paragraph 57, lines 5-11, paragraph 35, lines 6 -20); and

determining that the user has ceased inputting data (detecting terminating sessions) if the user's inputs fill any template from the database (filling the starting location field and the destination location field with "here and there" implies filling a template; paragraph 25, lines 12 – 15, paragraph 35, lines 6- 25).

As per claims 3, 11, Johnson et al., further disclose receiving the input from the user comprises the step of receiving a multi-modal input from the user (voice browser and graphical browser; paragraph 35, lines 6 - 20).

As per claims 4, and 12, Johnson et al., further disclose that receiving a multi-modal input from the group consisting of a text input, a speech input, and a handwritten input (enter information in text mode and voice mode, handwriting recognition; paragraph 34, lines 1-3, paragraph 22, line 27).

As per claims 5, 13, and 19, Johnson et al., further disclose accessing a plurality of semantic templates ("determine the word "here" corresponds to geographical location and "there" corresponds to the geographical location" implies accessing a plurality of semantic templates, since the multimodal fusion engine determines corresponding inputs between different modalities; paragraph 35, lines 6 - 20).

As per claims 6, and 14, Johnson et al., further disclose accessing a plurality of templates (uttering here to there and the voice browser fills the starting location field with here and the destination location field with there, while the graphical browser fills the starting and the destination location fields with geographical locations by clicking point on the map, implies accessing a plurality of templates) comprising combinations of possible user inputs and their possible mode input (multiple input entered through different modalities; paragraph 37, lines 3 – 6, paragraph 64, lines 1 – 3; paragraph 35, lines 6 -20).

As per claims 7, 15, and 20, Johnson et al., further disclose dynamically updating templates (uttering here to there and the voice browser fills the starting location field with here and the destination location field with there, while the graphical browser fills the starting and the destination location fields with geographical locations by clicking point on the map, implies having a plurality of templates) from database [the synchronization coordinator (used to forward the received information to the multimodal fusion engine), refrains from obtaining modality-specific instructions for those modalities identified to be muted implies dynamically updating templates from database by muting specific modes; paragraph 25, paragraph 30, lines 10 – 12; paragraph 35, lines 6 -20].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 2, 10, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson et al., (US Patent 6,807,529).

As per claims 2, 10, and 18, Johnson et al., do not disclose that determining that the user has ceased inputting data if the predetermined amount time has passed. However, since Johnson et al., disclose that if a user is expected to enter both voice and text information concurrently but the multimodal fusion engine does not receive the information for fusing within a period of time, it will assume that an error has occurred (paragraph 48, lines 11- 15). One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to determine that the user has ceased inputting data if the predetermined amount time has passed within Johnson et al., method, because that would let the multimodal fusion engine allow more time to elapse for voice information to be returned than for text information (paragraph 48, lines 15 – 18).

6. Claims 8, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson et al., (US Patent 6,807,529) as applied to claims 7, and 15, and in view of applicant's admitted prior art.

As per claims 8, and 16, Johnson et al., further disclose dynamically updating templates based on a characteristic taken from the group consisting of available modes of input (voice browser and graphical browser), and expected response from the user (expected information to be input), and the history and the current status of the task that the user is working on (providing information about which field has been filed by the user during a previous concurrent multimodal session state, and current state; paragraph 34, lines 20 – 23; paragraph 35, lines 6 – 11; paragraph 57, lines 5 – 12). However, Johnson et al., do not specifically teach a list of discourse obligations that constrain what the user can input in the next dialog turn.

In the same field of endeavor, applicant's admitted prior art teaches that checking discourse obligations is known and has been used in state-of-the-art dialog systems.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to consider discourse obligations list as taught by applicant's admitted prior art in Johnson et al., because that would improve the system, by predicting users' inputs.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leonard Saint-Cyr whose telephone number is (571) 272-4247. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon- Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on (571) 272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571)-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

LS
03/30/07



RICHEMOND DORVIL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER